My point is that that question was not left without consideration as stated by my friend, Mr. Padmanabha Pillai.

PRESIDENT: There is also this point. The money we could apply for the purpose was held in the shape of Government of India securities and we could realise only less than half the face value of these securities. We had no spare cash to invest. I do not know if that appears in the correspondence. I only mention another reason to show that the matter was not quite so simple.

MR. K. GEORGE: Not only that, Sir, our sinking fund then amounted to much less than what it is now. At the same time we enquired and found out that we could not profitably go in for these bonds.

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: Was any broker tried?

MR. K. GEORGE: No. We did not try that. Sir, I have now explained the portion sufficiently well. There is nothing at present necessitating the separation of the two departments, because all the work generally required to be done by the Fniancial Secretary is done by the Financial Secretary here, even though he is also the Account Officer. Even if there be a separate officer, he can do only what he does now. He may give his opinion. Government are not certainly bound to carry out all his recommendations, and in these circumstances I hope that my friend, Mr. Parameasvaran Pillai, will find his way to withdraw his resolution.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR: After listening to the very elaborate—

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I do not think that any useful purpose will be served by continuing the discussion. Now that the Financial Secretary and Account Officer has very categorically assured us that he can very well carry on the work of both the Financial Secretary and the Account Officer to his best abilities, and as he has requested us to wait for some time more before moving this question, I have absolutely no objection to wait for some time more. Before withdrawing my resolution, I might say that the reasons given by him are not sufficiently convincing.

PRESIDENT: Strictly speaking, a member withdrawing a resolution cannot make any observations on the merits of it. You must either withdraw or press the resolution.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I withdraw the resolution.

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

RESOLUTION *RE* TRAINING OF UNDERGRADUATE TEACHERS.

PRESIDENT: The next resolution stands in the name of Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai and runs as follows:

"That this Council recommends to the Government that the period of training for undergraduate teachers in the Education Department be reduced to one year."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai.]

I request the member to move it.

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI: I beg to move the following resolution:

"That this Council recommends to the Government that the period of training for undergraduate teachers in the Education Department be reduced to one year."

In support of this resolution I wish to bring the following points for the consideration of this House.

(1) The period of training for graduates was one year and that for undergraduates and vernacular school teachers two years. A few years ago the period of training for holders of the Vernacular Higher certificate and the vernacular School Leaving Certificate, was reduced to one year. The period of 2 years for undergraduates still continues. The reasons for reducing the period of training for vernacular school teachers might have moved the Government to reduce the period for undergraduates also. This matter was moved at the last session of the Head Masters' Conference and I am told the general sense of the conference was in favour of reducing the period. Again, the Educational Expenditure Committee has also recommended the same. Still the Government or the department persists in training the undergraduates for 2 years.

There was an old reason advanced for this, *i. e.*, that the undergraduates should have their knowledge of the several subjects extended along with their being trained professionally. The force of this argument falls to the ground when we see that Indian Educational policy required 1 year of training for graduates, 2 years for undergraduates and 3 for teachers of elementary schools. This Government, which had also accepted this policy and altered the 3 years in the last case to 2 and later on to 1 year, the 2 years for undergraduates being still kept up.

(2) Though the original idea was to devote the first year to the extension of knowledge and the second year to the teaching of educational theory and method of teaching and doing practical work, I am told that the first year is now devoted to the teaching of educational theory and to the writing of lesson notes for all subjects from class II to Form III, and the second year to practical work alone. All this, I submit, can be done in one year equally efficiently.

(3) Government have decided that the vernacular higher and lower teachers should have their training finished in one year. The attainments of these teachers cannot be superior to those of undergraduates. They have not the convenience or the equipment to read up books giving general information and books on educational theory and practice and such books are very few in the vernacular. Still they are to be trained only for one year. Is it not then absurd to force the undergraduates to undergo a two years' course of training, especially when they can be and are reading good and up-to-date books on the subject?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(4) No undergraduate teacher is ordinarily taken for training in the first year of his appointment. By the time he is selected for training he has had much experience in teaching, extended considerably his general information, and read many books on educational theory and practice. And if he is under a trained head-master (who in most schools has at least the status and qualifications of a lecturer in the Training College) the undergraduate teacher is sufficiently trained for all practical purposes, though he is not technically so. Does it not then stand to reason to consider that one year is more than enough for the training of an undergraduate in the Training College, while his brother teacher who has no such convenience is being completely trained in one year?

(5) Sir, by reducing this period of training to one year without impairing efficiency, Government can save a good round sum every year under the following items:

	Stipend per month for each.	Stipend per annum.
(1) 13 teachers from Departmental Schools ...	Rs. 23 + 5.	Rs. 364 × 12 = Rs. 4,368.
(2) 12 teachers from Private Schools ...	Rs.	Rs. 150 × 12 = Rs. 1,800.
(3) 2 lecturers and 1 Manual training teacher ...	Rs. 200 + 200 + 175	Rs. 575 × 12 = Rs. 6,900.
	Total.....	Rs. 13,068.

This is a big amount which can be utilised for the many urgent needs of schools.

(6) As the number of undergraduate teachers is increasing rapidly, chiefly owing to the rapid expansion of English education, there is a great demand for trained teachers. But, as the course is for two years, only 25 teachers are trained every year. But if the course is only for one year, double the present number can be trained and there will be no dearth of professionally qualified teachers.

There are still some English schools which have not even a single trained teacher on their staff and I know of undergraduate teachers now in vernacular schools who have put in nearly 9 years' service but are not yet provided with a chance of getting themselves trained. Educational reports say that paucity of trained hands means poorer instruction. If it is so, are we justified in keeping several schools and classes so long without giving them the benefit of instruction from trained teachers? Is not the country so much the poorer, when some of its citizens are denied the best instruction which we could have given them by increasing the number of teachers under training by reducing the period to one year?

(7) Lastly, there is a personal reason. The undergraduate teacher by the time he is taken for training might have settled down

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[The Rev. Fr. Kuriakose Vettikkapalli.]

with a family and might be getting Rs. 40 per month. But when taken for training, he is exiled for 2 years in Trivandrum, where living is very costly. He cannot think of setting up an establishment there. Instead of a deputation allowance in addition to his pay, he gets only Rs. 25 + Rs. 3 as stipend, out of which he has to pay the monthly fee of Rs. 5, buy books, note books, etc., and to meet boarding, travelling and other charges to the extent of Rs. 20, leaving only Rs. 3 for his wife and children at home. He is not able to make both ends meet. The dire consequences of such a situation I need not detail.

What I wish to urge on the attention of this House is: "If we can help it, why should we put this unfortunate undergraduate teacher to the exile of 2 years and thus cause his wife and children to a life of separation and starvation for such a long period, when he can safely get, during one year, what he is unnecessarily forced to gather in two years and when his fellow-workers are exiled only for one year for the same purpose?

I, therefore, place this resolution for the acceptance of this House.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR: I second the motion.

MR. C. J. CURIEN: Sir,—

MR. S. PARAMESVARA AIYAR: There is an amendment to the resolution.

PRESIDENT: Will you kindly sit down, Mr. Curien? There is an amendment to this resolution by Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai.

It runs as follows:

"*Add*, at the end of the resolution, the words 'giving the benefit of the reduction in the period to the present first year student teachers also."

Does the mover of the resolution accept the amendment?

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI: Yes, Sir.

MR. C. J. CURIEN: Basing on the most convincing and tangible reasons of Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai for the reduction of training for the undergraduates from two years to one, I may be allowed to extend my strong support to the motion.

THE REV. FR. KURIAKOSE VETTIKKAPALLI: Sir, I beg to support the motion, and in doing so I beg to add that, during the discussion of the general budget as well as when the demand for the Education Department was before this House, many complaints had been raised that the expenditure on account of our Education Department has gone too high, beyond all proportion, and that it is high time for us all to find out some means to curtail and bring it down to the normal. Here I find a very good opportunity for bringing it down without in any way impairing the efficiency of the department. For, as Mr. Kochukunju Pillai clearly showed, there is absolutely no use in extending the term of these undergraduates' training to two years. The training for graduates is done in one year; the same is the case with the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

higher vernacular teachers. From all the difficulties they feel, I would wish to say that it would be saving a good sum (about Rs. 13,000 or Rs. 14,000) if we bring down the training period from two years to one year. That sum can very well be utilised for other purposes.

I would here mention the long-standing cry of the vernacular teachers for enhancing their poor salary, as well as that of the managers for enhancement of the aid given to them. Now, if we utilise this money and give them some satisfaction, it will be a real blessing.

Secondly, we have to provide the school managers who have to pay from their own pockets, to get on with their schools. In spite of that, when they send their teachers for training, they have to meet the expenditure themselves. Half the stipend, namely, Rs. 12 as. 8 must be paid by these private school managers. Now, if, to the already heavy burden on their shoulders, we add this also, it will indeed be a real hardship to them. So, I strongly support the motion in consideration of the difficulties to which the private school managers and undergraduate teachers are put by this two years' training system.

MR. L. C. HODGSON: Sir, I find myself in rather a difficult position with regard to this question. Before giving my views on the subject I will allude to one or two utterances made by my friend, Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai. He told us quite truly that the graduate course for training is only one year. He made that an argument for reducing the course of training for undergraduates from two years to one. I do not think that the two cases are parallel. There is really much difference between the undergraduate and the graduate who has gone through the whole arts course and has passed the B. A. Examination in two branches. He has a large amount of general and special knowledge and he can go straight to the Training College and is better equipped for completing the course in one year.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: The two grades of teachers vary—the graduate teachers and the undergraduate teachers. So, according to that, should not the courses of training also vary?

MR. L. C. HODGSON: I think I can satisfy Mr. Hoogewerf by saying that there are many people who think—and I agree with them—that one year is too short for the graduate. But it is reasonable to think that the graduate, who has gained considerable knowledge by studying for his degree, should be better able to appreciate and benfit by the training in one year, than the undergraduate.

Mr. Kochukunju Pillai drew another analogy also, namely, that in the case of the vernacular school teachers, the training period was reduced from two years to one. That I believe and consider to have been a very unwise movement taken by my predecessor, and I may say that persons who have the business of training these vernacular teachers have more than once appealed against it and have more than once asked whether the two years' course could not be restored for the vernacular teachers also. That complaint I have had, not merely from departmental schools, but also from private school managers who urged that the course should be extended to two years. I do not think either

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. L. C. Hodgson.]

of these analogies counts for much. Mr. Kochukunju Pillai said that formerly it used to be viewed that undergraduates when sent up for training had to spend the first year in consolidating their general knowledge. That is the practice still and even if Mr. Kochukunju Pillai's resolution is carried they will still have to spend the first six months of the course in consolidating and digesting the general knowledge they have gained from the schools and they will only get 6 months' actual training. Dr. Clark informs me that he will have to do the whole of the training work in 6 months.

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: May I know what is the practice elsewhere?

MR. L. C. HODGSON: You mean the length of the course?

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: Yes.

MR. L. C. HODGSON: I am coming to that. Mr. Kochukunju Pillai thinks that the undergraduate of one year's training will have all the requisite knowledge and training, because he will be placed under a trained head-master and there the undergraduates will imbibe these principles and will be able to put them into practice under the guidance of the trained head-masters. Sir, there are a great many private school head-masters who are not trained men. A great many undergraduates have to serve under untrained head-masters. Now, Mr. Kochukunju Pillai and the Rev. Fr. Vettikkapalli have told me that this proposal will result in a very large financial gain to Government, I do not see it. I presume that, if the course is reduced to one year, instead of taking 25 students for the first year and continuing their course for the second year and taking another batch of 25, having altogether 50 at a time, we shall, in future, have 50 every year. That is, we shall train the same number of students, and we shall have to pay the same amount as stipends as at present. Mr. Kochukunju Pillai thinks that we can reduce 2 or 3 lecturers and cut down the expenditure of training. I think he is very much mistaken.

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: Shall we not have more trained men then?

MR. L. C. HODGSON: I will come to that. That is not answering Mr. Kochukunju Pillai's arguments. He said that we could save the expenditure by reducing the course to one year. That, I believe, is wholly incorrect. We shall, of course, get the whole lot trained in a shorter time, but I do not know if we can exhaust all the undergraduates even if we train them at the rate of 50 per annum. Mr. Kochukunju Pillai thinks it will be better to train more people on his principle than a few on the present principle. It is a matter of opinion. Whether it is better to turn out 25 fully-trained men or to turn out 50 semi-trained people, it is for you to decide. Personally, I do not agree with Mr. Kochukunju Pillai.

Lastly, he referred to the domestic difficulties which many of these undergraduate teachers have to undergo. I sympathise with these

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

teachers who are given a small stipend of Rs. 25 and have to pay fees at the same time. I may tell the House that I sympathise with them, and I would like to see all of them better remunerated than they are at present, and I might say that, after attempting for several years to bring it about, it has been possible— thanks to your support, Sir, in your capacity of Dewan— to put an end to one great hardship which teachers sent for training previously were liable to—I refer to the case of those who did not succeed in getting a good probationary certificate. Under the old rules they had to undergo a further year's or six months' training, during which they received no pay, and were given no stipend, but had to pay fees. I am glad to say that we have abolished that rule. That is by the way.

Now, I think, I have dealt with all the important points of Mr. Kochukunju Pillai. There are one or two things which I should like to say myself on this subject. As we were told, this matter has come up more than once and I will just read one letter from Dr. Clark on the subject. In connection with the recommendations of the Finance Committee I wrote to Government:

"In the case of those who pass, such knowledge as they acquire is ill-digested, and for those of them who are about to become teachers, it is of the highest value that they should devote the best part of a year in the Training College, to digesting and supplementing their general education. It would, therefore, be disastrous to reduce the training course of undergraduates to one year."

The result of that correspondence was that Government decided to adhere to the present two years' course and said that it could not be reduced. Since Mr. Kochukunju Pillai has brought forward his proposal, I wrote to Dr. Clark to get his opinion in the matter. He wrote to me to say:

"The educational result of reducing the training course for undergraduates to one year would be to make a satisfactory course an impossibility. If there is any idea of reducing the course, I can only say that it is a sadly retrograde step for which the schools will ultimately pay."

Sir, I have been in Travancore a good many years, and in one capacity or another I have always been watching the educational progress of the State. I took part in the work of the Education Committee of 1908 and I took a great deal of interest in the reforms of Dr. Mitchell. Dr. Bishop was one of my closest friends and I have myself endeavoured to carry on the work of the department for some years. I cannot but observe that there have been several downward steps during these years. Dr. Mitchell and Sir. P. Rajagopalachariar put the department on a very sound footing and in their reforms they insisted upon having graduate teachers for every secondary school right down to the First Form. Now, any new-fledged school-boy who gets his School Leaving Certificate immediately becomes a teacher of any class up to the Third Form. That, Sir, is one downward step. Another step in the same direction has been, for financial reasons, the raising of the number of pupils in each class, which is not altogether in the best interest of the pupils themselves.

PRESIDENT: I do not know whether it arises here.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. L. C. Hodgson.]

MR. L. C. HODGSON: Thank you, Sir. The third step was the reduction of the period of training for the vernacular school teachers from two years to one. Why not reduce the period of the undergraduate training also, is the question now. Sir, I would ask Mr. Kochukunju Pillai to consider whether it is, after all, fair to the pupils and their parents if the pupils are to be taught by semi-trained teachers. We are obliged to employ callow school final men as teachers as we can no longer employ graduates for all classes. Our ambition and hope is to train as many of them as we can in the interest of the pupils. If we are going to give them only one year in the Training College, Dr. Clark says that the training will be unsatisfactory, and I do not think we would be doing justice to the pupils and to their parents. I would leave that for the House to decide.

Mr. Nidiry has asked me what is the practice in Madras and elsewhere. I do not really see his object in ascertaining what is done in Madras, Cochin and Mysore. Why should we follow the practice in other places? Why should we not set the example? In the matter of education, in many respects we do set the example. We have a larger number of literates than anywhere else in India. I do not mean to say 125 per cent. like my friend, the late Mr. Ramaswami Aiyar. The actual number of literates is very considerable, and I think greater than in any other State, except possibly Mysore. I have not got the exact figures. Why should we do what Mysore does or what Madras does? For Mr. Nidiry's information, I might say that in Madras it is one year. In Mysore it is one year. But in little Cochin it is two years. I do not say we should follow Cochin in this. I would only observe that Cochin does the right thing.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Have they not got a separate institution there?

MR. L. C. HODGSON: They have not got a separate Training College. Then, Sir, I would like to say this much about this matter. After all, I consider this a matter for experts. The non-official members were telling us in connection with the Standing Committees that they wanted to learn all about education before they gave advice.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: "First learn and then advise" that was what I said.

MR. L. C. HODGSON: Yes, learn first. The present position is that the members as regards education are in *statu pupillari*. Sir, the present motion shows that they have much to learn about education. I may say I have some knowledge of the subject; for some years, I was a member of the Madras Board of Examiners for teachers' certificates, and the opinion of Dr. Clark who has made a life-study of the subject ought to carry great weight. Sir, I remember that a few years ago a motor car was lent to a certain person and that person insisted upon a bigger load being carried than the car could support. The driver who

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

was an expert mechanic said that the car could not take that load. The gentleman insisted. The result was the car collapsed and was soon afterwards sold for a trifle. That is my analogy. I would ask that a similar view may be taken of this question also. It may be left to the experts.

One word with regard to Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai's amendment, *viz.*, that if this measure is carried, then the present pupils shall be allowed to complete the course at the end of this year. I would adduce another analogy with regard to this. Fifteen or sixteen years ago, when Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai was a student in the college, he excelled in athletic feats, especially in running and jumping. I do not know whether he still keeps up the practice. Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai will understand when I say that, if we start a man on a race for a mile, he will start at a much slower pace than a man who goes for a half a mile race and at the end of the first quarter of the course he will not have made as much progress as the man who started for the shorter course. It is not rational to expect that the person who started on a training course of 2 years and has now reached the first quarter of that course which has been mapped out for 2 years, should be able to complete the whole course within one single year. Consequently, I think Mr. Raman Pillai's amendment at all events ought not to be adopted. It ought to be left to the Principal of the Training College to see whether it would be possible or not.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR: May I know, Sir, whether it is not a matter of practice in the department to allow the undergraduate teachers to teach for a number of years before they are asked to go to the Training College?

MR. L. C. HODGSON: Not for a longer period than is reasonable. We send undergraduates for training as early as possible.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR: Do they not begin to teach before they are trained?

MR. L. C. HODGSON: They have to do it. They must have some experience in teaching before they go to the Training College. We try our best not to leave them long without training.

Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai and the Reverend Father said that some of the vernacular school teachers are left for 8 or 9 years without being trained. It is true that some of these persons try to escape training by taking advantage of the rule that places untrained teachers of 10 years' experience on the same footing as trained teachers. When they get to 8 or 9 years' service, it is very difficult to get them trained, because, after one or two years, they get the same result without training.

Sir, my position, as I said at the beginning, is very difficult. The proposal has been made and I have said all I can against it. I have done this in the interest of the department that the Government have honoured me by placing me in charge of. If I have succeeded in

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. A. Hoogewerf].

impressing the House against the motion, I am doubly glad. If, however, the house decides to carry Mr. Kochukunju Pillai's motion I have to say that the Government do not intend to oppose it.

PRESIDENT: I want to say that in this matter the Government keep an open mind and would allow the official members to vote as they think fit.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: Hear, hear.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: Sir, the arguments of the member for education appear to me not very convincing. Seeing that graduates require only one year's training, and the period of training of vernacular teachers has been reduced from two years to one, I do not see why undergraduates alone should go through a training of two years. Mr. Hodgson said that his predecessor had made a mistake in reducing the period of training for vernacular teachers from two to one year; and he also spoke of expert opinion. I think his predecessor's opinion was also expert opinion. So expert opinion does not count for much in this matter.

MR. L. C. HODGSON: Of course, so far as training is concerned, Dr. Clark is the better expert, and he is against the reduction. Dr. Mitchell's is only secondary.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: Coming to the financial aspect of the question, it is for the Financial Secretary to say whether it will cost less to have 25 undergraduates for two years than 50 undergraduates for one year. Will he please speak on it?

PRESIDENT: You cannot compel the Financial Secretary to speak.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: I want him to speak only if he wishes. The Director's argument that one year's training is enough for a graduate on account of his general knowledge and high equipment and that the undergraduate does not possess such knowledge and equipment cannot hold water, as the graduate and the undergraduate have to teach in classes according to their respective qualifications. The Director further tried to show that one year's training would not qualify the undergraduate for teaching and that the educational authorities would have to be responsible to the parents and guardians of students, if well-qualified teachers were not provided in schools. The answer elicited by Mr. Krishna Aiyangar that there are many teachers who have not undergone any training, and that it is only some years after these teachers have been teaching that they are sent for training knocks the bottom out of this argument. I have been informed by some of the undergraduates in the Training College here that they are wasting their time during the second year. This might be a slight exaggeration. Most of these teachers are family men and it is very hard that they should leave their family behind and come here in the middle of their

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

career on a stipend of Rs. 20 or so—and living is by no means cheap in Trivandrum. It is the aided schools that are hardest hit by this arrangement. For these resons, I fully support the resolution.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: Is the resolution as amended that is being discussed?

PRESIDENT: Yes, as amended.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: Has the amendment been accepted by the House?

PRESIDENT: It has been accepted by the mover.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: I believe there will be some difficulty in accepting the amendment. As Mr. Hodgson has explained, those who joined this year would not have made any progress at all, on the understanding that they would have to continue for two years.

PRESIDENT: After the discussion is over, I will put the amendment to the vote first.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: Sir, my friend, Mr. Kochukunju Pillai, has given very excellent reasons why this resolution ought to be accepted by the House—and I knew beforehand that he would advance very cogent reasons. I thought that this was the opportunity to give relief to the unfortunate undergraduates who joined their class this year and I hope that the Principal of the Training College would be able to do away with this set of students even this year. It is only three months since these student-teachers began the course. I think the deficiency can be made up by the Principal of the Training College if he extends their course by two months. At any rate, if any member, official or non-official, feels any conscientious objection to vote for the amendment, I shall be only too glad to withdraw the same; and I do not know whether I will be in order in doing so, since the mover of the resolution himself has accepted it, before my moving.

PRESIDENT: Was it so? I thought the amendment was formally moved. In any case, it may now be withdrawn with the leave of the House.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: If that be so, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

PRESIDENT: The substantial resolution remains.

MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR: Sir, Mr. Hodgson has argued his case with the skill of a professional advocate. He advanced various reasons—some convincing, but others scarcely so. One of the arguments that he advanced was that, in a prior communication of his, he had expressed his decided opinion that he was against the present measure. That opinion might have been come to after great deliberation. But doubts arise as to whether he has kept an open mind and whether the arguments of Mr. Kochukunju Pillai might have met with the very same response as they would have had otherwise. However, he also

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. S. Krishna Aiyar.]

fortified himself with the opinion of Dr. Clark, the Principal of the Training College. Precedents in our departments have very great value, but I do not know whether precedents would carry so much weight in a matter of this kind. The first argument that I heard him advance was that the graduate has plently of general and special knowledge—not so the undergraduate. Therefore, another year's course is necessary to give him the same sort of special and general knowledge that the graduate has already secured. One feels very grave doubts as to whether the function of the Training College is to give general education or only to fit a teacher to be a better teacher, in other words, to train him in his profession. As far as general knowledge is concerned, he may be left to himself to read and to digest, of course, with the guidance of the Principal of the College and the other teachers. I have therefore to say that that argument does not seem to carry much weight with it.

The second argument that I heard advanced was that, in respect of vernacular schools, there have been complaints from the teachers of the vernacular department that the present term must be extended, and that one year's course would not suffice. We were further told that some people had memorialised the Director also on that subject. Now, I would put the question, "Are these teachers the best authorities on the subject, and if so, since the teachers have been complaining and since they have been memorialising, what fate these memorials have met with and why he has not increased the course, especially when he found that the teachers"—

MR. L. C. HODGSON: It was the authorities of the Training Schools. The C. N. Institution in Kottayam and the Buchanan institute wrote very strongly to me on the subject and I thought Mr. Krishna Aiyar already knew it.

MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR: I thank him for the information. So far as the C. N. Institute is concerned, I understand that the main function of the institution is to train people for the clerical profession.

MR. L. C. HODGSON: No, Sir, there is another school for training teachers also.

MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR: I stand corrected. It does not affect the argument that I put forward. If Mr. Hodgson had considered the arguments and memorials advanced by those other teachers, he would certainly have tried to extend the term, if he really thought that they had very great weight.

MR. L. C. HODGSON: It should be within my power.

MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR: Whatever that be, it does not appear to be an argument for the extension of the term for the training of the undergraduate teachers. That there has been a complaint as regards the course for the vernacular teachers does not appear to be

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

relevant for the consideration of the restriction of the term for the training of the undergraduate.

The third argument that I heard advanced was put thus: "Is it fair to the guardians that boys should be taught by half-trained teachers?" Here, the question put by Mr. Krishna Aiyangar was very pertinent and, though Mr. Hodgson in his answer did not give the number of years, he admitted that an undergraduate has to serve as a teacher before he is selected for training, and we have to take it from his statement and Mr. Kochukunju Pillai's that teachers have to wait on for a certain number of years. What about these absolutely untrained teachers being allowed to teach for 6, 8 or 10 years? Once again in answer to the query of Mr. Nidiry, Mr. Hodgson was stating that Travancore might take the lead in such matters. Travancore need not follow. Travancore is educationally so far advanced that it need not take the opinion of the outside. That is very commendable and we appreciate it very much. It is a very great compliment to ourselves. If it were true, why not accept the opinion of Travancoreans like Mr. Kochukunju Pillai? Why make further concession to outside experts? However, as Mr. Hodgson fortified his case by the precedent of Cochin, we are made to understand that to a certain extent he is prepared to take outside lead. I can very well understand the last argument of his, *viz.*, that such matters should be left to the opinion of experts and not to laymen like us who may not be able to understand or appreciate the position properly. I have great regard for the opinion of experts. But experts themselves must be in a frame of mind to reconsider, to review the situation. Possibly lay people might be able to advance arguments which might convince experts. We only wish that these experts do not say that, because they have already made a pronouncement, they are not going to reconsider the question. We wish that Mr. Hodgson keeps an open mind. I have not discussed the question of the analogy with regard to Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai's amendment.

PRESIDENT: The amendment has been withdrawn.

MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR: I only wish to say that analogies are not arguments. Under the circumstances, with all respect for experts, I must say that Mr. Kochukunju Pillai's arguments are to me more appealing than the expert opinion of Mr. Hodgson.

MR P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I also wish to support Mr. Kochukunju Pillai. The discussion has only illustrated one fact that a bad case cannot be improved by the advocacy, even of Mr. Hodgson. I wish to make only two other observations with regard to the remarks of Mr. Hodgson. That is to say, with respect to the practice elsewhere. Mr. Hodgson admits that what Dr. Clark finds absolutely impossible is quite feasible in Madras and some other places. He has taken advantage of the solitary instance of Cochin in this matter and has pleaded that Cochin has to be preferred to Madras. I fail to see on what particular principle we have to prefer Cochin in this matter. First of all, I cannot persuade myself to put Travancore, as it is, on

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[The President.]

the same footing as Cochin. There are various differences between them. Some may be very queer. With respect to the average attendance in the training school at Cochin, I should like to know some further details, before we can allow ourselves to be guided by the practice there. Then, he also admitted that that is an argument which goes beyond the present discussion and that teachers without any training are allowed to teach in schools without seriously impairing the efficiency of teaching. That fact having been considered, the argument is liable to be advanced not only with respect to restriction of the present training for undergraduates but also as an argument against the whole system of training. We are not going to utilise it for that purpose at this juncture. There is another argument with respect to the course of training for the vernacular teachers. There is evidently a sort of opinion that experts are intelligent and their opinions are valid. How far reliance can be placed on their conflicting opinions is a matter of question. For there is serious conflict of view between Mr. Hodgson and Dr. Bishop on the point and I should also like to know whether, till this question was seriously raised in this House and the particular question of the period of training which the vernacular teachers are obliged to have, this particular question was seriously considered by Mr. Hodgson himself, except when he found that this inconvenient factor was brought up as a matter under discussion now. I wish to know whether he has raised any objection against the curtailment of the period of the vernacular teachers' training.

PRESIDENT: He has already said that he has made a representation to Government.

MR. L. C. HODGSON: That was brought in the time of my predecessor and not in my time—in the time of Dr. Bishop.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Did Mr. Hodgson recommend to the Government—

MR. L. C. HODGSON: Yes, I have already said so.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: I am sorry I did not hear.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: Sir, I object to members addressing each other.

MR. L. C. HODGSON: I beg your pardon.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: That is because of the accoustic properties of this hall. We have to use short cuts as far as possible. (*Laughter.*)

With these observations, I support the motion of Mr. Kochukunju Pillai.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN: I move for a closure.

The motion for closure was put and carried.

PRESIDENT: I call upon Mr. Kochukunju Pillai to make his reply.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI: Sir, I do not think I have got much to say by way of reply because all the points raised by Mr. Hodgson were answered in an able manner by my friends on this side of the House, and so I have nothing more to say.

MR. L. C. HODGSON: Sir, I have very little more to say. Just one or two points. I noticed that Mr. Hoogewerf and Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai and one or two others spoke in this connection about the unfortunate undergraduate teachers. I cannot help thinking that it is in the interest of these undergraduates more than in the interest of the pupils of these schools that this motion has been brought forward. It will, of course, benefit the teachers. Under the new reorganisation those who are trained will get a slightly higher remuneration than untrained people. Mr. Hoogewerf and Mr. Kochukunju Pillai referred to the unfortunate teacher who has to live away from his family for two years. I quite agree that it is rather hard and I think the best remedy for it is to give him a bigger stipend. But even if the course is reduced, the hardship of being separated from his family will not be removed and a second year's separation will not be felt so much as the first as he will have got accustomed to it by the end of the first year (*Laughter.*)

Mr. A. HOOGEWERF: Is not one year better than two years?

MR. L. C. HODGSON: Mr. Krishna Aiyar in a very eloquent and able speech questioned whether I kept an open mind. It is not easy to keep an open mind in a matter to which you have given much thought and when you are convinced of the truth of a certain view. I may say I have been fully convinced in this matter. Mr. Krishna Aiyar alluded to some quotation of mine. I do not recollect that I have made any quotation; but I might remark that I heard a well-known quotation from Hamlet four times misapplied to-day.

Then Mr. Krishna Aiyar referred to the function of the Training College. Why should the Training College do anything but training people? Why should it help to consolidate knowledge? That was what the Expenditure Committee said. The Expenditure Committee in the minority report said—I will read it, it is not long—

> "There would be some force in the Committee's remark that it is not the function of a training institution to impart general instruction which should be sufficiently provided in the ordinary schools, if it were not for the fact, which the educational members of the Committee know perfectly well, that in South India even the best pupils in the best schools study more with the aim of passing examinations than of acquiring knowledge. This incidentally is the reason why so many of them fail."

I do not think this is an exaggerated view of the case. In fact I received a letter once from a parent who wrote to me in words something like this: "When pupils before the examination endeavour to foresee what questions are going to come in the examination and then if they do not come, they fail. This is a solemn truth." That, Sir, is the view of a responsible parent. I am afraid my conclusion is very largely based on the fact that pupils are sent to school merely with the object of passing their examinations and not so much with the object of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Tariatu Kunjitomman.]

acquiring knowledge. Many of them may pass examinations, but they do not acquire knowledge. So they need a certain amount of time for consolidating their knowledge before training. Mr. Krishna Aiyangar and others referred to the fact that a large number of untrained teachers are teaching in our schools. I do not know whether this measure will make things better. If we want to have all these teachers trained, one or two training colleges will not be enough. We require half a dozen training colleges. Even if we train at the rate of 50 per annum, we cannot finish the business. My contention is that it is better to go rather slowly and train them well than go fast and leave them half-trained.

PRESIDENT: I shall now put the resolution to the vote.

The resolution was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLUTION RE. CULTIVATION OF ROYAL TREES, TOBACCO, ETC.

PRESIDENT: The next resolution is in the name of Mr. Tariatu Kunjitomman and runs thus :

"That this Council recommends to the Government that people be freely allowed to plant teak, blackwood, sandalwood, tobacco or other plants and trees and also to enjoy them fully, whether they are planted and cultivated, or grow themselves."

I request Mr Kunjitomman to move it.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN: ഞാൻ താഴ്ത്തപ്പുറയുന്ന പ്രമേയം വായിക്കുന്നു.

"തേക്കോ, ഈട്ടിയോ, ചന്ദനമോ, പുകയിലയോ മറ്റു യുക്തമെന്നുതോന്നുന്ന ചെടികളോ വൃക്ഷങ്ങളോ കൃഷിചെയ്യുന്നതിനും കൃഷിചെയ്തോ താനെ മുളച്ചോ ഉണ്ടായവയെ യഥേഷ്ടം ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്നതിനും ജനങ്ങൾക്ക സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം നല്കുണമെന്ന് ഈ യോഗം ഗവർണ്മെൻറിനോട് ശുപാർശചെയ്യുന്നു."

സർ, കൃഷി പ്രധാനതൊഴിലായ ഈരാജ്യത്തു കാഷ്ികമായ അഭിവൃദ്ധിയും അതിനാൽ ജനങ്ങൾക്കും ഗവർണ്മെൻറിനും ഐശ്വര്യവും ഉണ്ടാകണമെന്നുള്ള ഉദ്ദേശമാണ് ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ ഇവിടെ കൊണ്ടുവരുവാൻ എന്നെ പ്രേരിപ്പിച്ചത്. ഇവിടത്തെ ജനങ്ങളിൽ എതുയും അധികഭാഗവും കൃഷിക്കാരും, ഗവർണ്മെൻറിൻെറ മുതലെടുപ്പിൽ പ്രധാനഭാഗം കൃഷിക്കാരിൽ നിന്നുള്ള ഭൂനികുതിയും ആണെങ്കിലും ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ ആവശ്യങ്ങൾക്കുള്ള അനേകം സാധനങ്ങൾ അന്യദേശങ്ങളിൽ കൃഷി ചെയ്യണ്ടാക്കുന്നവയായിരിക്കുന്നു. ഇവയുടെ വിലയായി അനവധി പണം വിദേശത്തേക്കു പോയിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്നു. ജനങ്ങളുടെ ഉപജീവനമാർഗ്ഗം പ്രധാനമായി കൈത്തൊഴിലിനേയും കച്ചവടത്തേയും ആശ്രയിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന രാജ്യങ്ങൾതന്നെ, കഴിഞ്ഞ മഹായുദ്ധകാലത്തു കപ്പൽവ്യാപാ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly